

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MARYLAND
NORTHERN DIVISION**

Tyjuana Wilson,	:	
	:	Civil Action No.: _____
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
v.	:	
	:	
Regional Adjustment Bureau, Inc.; and	:	
DOES 1-10, inclusive,	:	COMPLAINT
	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	

For this Complaint, the Plaintiff, Tyjuana Wilson, by undersigned counsel, states as follows:

JURISDICTION

1. This action arises out of Defendants' repeated violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq. ("FDCPA"), and the invasions of Plaintiff's personal privacy by the Defendants and their agents in their illegal efforts to collect a consumer debt.
2. Supplemental jurisdiction exists pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1337.
3. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331(b), in that the Defendants transact business in this District and a substantial portion of the acts giving rise to this action occurred in this District.

PARTIES

4. The Plaintiff, Tyjuana Wilson ("Plaintiff"), is an adult individual residing in Baltimore, Maryland, and is a "consumer" as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).

5. Defendant Regional Adjustment Bureau, Inc. (“RAB”), is a Tennessee business entity with an address of 7000 Goodlett Farms Parkway, Memphis, Tennessee 38016, operating as a collection agency, and is a “debt collector” as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6).

6. Does 1-10 (the “Collectors”) are individual collectors employed by RAB and whose identities are currently unknown to the Plaintiff. One or more of the Collectors may be joined as parties once their identities are disclosed through discovery.

7. RAB at all times acted by and through one or more of the Collectors.

ALLEGATIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL COUNTS

A. The Debt

8. The Plaintiff incurred a financial obligation in the approximate amount of \$90,000.00 (the “Debt”) to a creditor (the “Creditor”) for a student loan.

9. The Debt arose from services provided by the Creditor which were primarily for family, personal or household purposes and which meets the definition of a “debt” under 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(5).

10. The Debt was purchased, assigned or transferred to RAB for collection, or RAB was employed by the Creditor to collect the Debt.

11. The Defendants attempted to collect the Debt and, as such, engaged in “communications” as defined in 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(2).

B. RAB Engages in Harassment and Abusive Tactics

12. RAB called the Plaintiff numerous times in an attempt to collect the Debt.

13. RAB was rude and abusive when speaking to the Plaintiff.

14. The Plaintiff by written correspondence requested for RAB to verify the Debt.

Instead of verifying the Debt, RAB told the Plaintiff that “you work for the NAACP. You should pay your Debt.”

15. RAB continues to contact the Plaintiff even though RAB has yet to verify the Debt.

16. RAB called the Plaintiff at her place of employment numerous times in an attempt to collect the Debt even though the Plaintiff told RAB that she cannot be contacted there.

17. RAB threatened to injure the Plaintiff’s credit rating.

18. RAB is adding interest and fees in violation of the original Debt agreement.

19. RAB failed to notify the Plaintiff of her rights under state and federal law by written correspondence within five (5) days after initial contact, including the right to dispute the Debt.

C. Plaintiff Suffered Actual Damages

20. The Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer actual damages as a result of the Defendants’ unlawful conduct.

21. As a direct consequence of the Defendants’ acts, practices and conduct, the Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer from humiliation, anger, fear, frustration and embarrassment.

22. The Defendants’ conduct was so outrageous in character, and so extreme in degree, as to go beyond all possible bounds of decency, and to be regarded as atrocious, and utterly intolerable in a civilized community.

COUNT I **VIOLATIONS OF THE FDCPA 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq.**

23. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this

Complaint as though fully stated herein.

24. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692c(a)(1) in that Defendants contacted the Plaintiff at a place and during a time known to be inconvenient for the Plaintiff.

25. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692c(a)(3) in that Defendants contacted the Plaintiff at his place of employment, knowing that the Plaintiff's employer prohibited such communications.

26. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(2) in that Defendants used profane and abusive language when speaking with the consumer.

27. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(5) in that Defendants caused a phone to ring repeatedly and engaged the Plaintiff in telephone conversations, with the intent to annoy and harass.

28. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(2) in that Defendants misrepresented the character, amount and legal status of the Debt.

29. The Defendants' conduct violated in that Defendants threatened to communicate false credit information, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(8).

30. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(10) in that Defendants employed false and deceptive means to collect a debt.

31. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692f(1) in that Defendants attempted to collect an amount not authorized by the agreement creating the Debt.

32. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a)(3) in that Defendants failed to send the Plaintiff a validation notice stating the Plaintiff's right to dispute the Debt within thirty days.

33. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a)(4) in that Defendants

failed to send the Plaintiff a validation notice informing the Plaintiff of a right to have verification and judgment mailed to the Plaintiff.

34. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a)(5) in that Defendants failed to send the Plaintiff a validation notice containing the name and address of the original creditor.

35. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(b) in that Defendants continued collection efforts even though the Debt had not been validated.

36. The foregoing acts and omissions of the Defendant constitute numerous and multiple violations of the FDCPA, including every one of the above-cited provisions.

37. The Plaintiff is entitled to damages as a result of Defendant's violations.

COUNT II
VIOLATIONS OF THE MARYLAND CONSUMER DEBT COLLECTION ACT
MD. CODE COMM. LAW § 14-201, et seq.

38. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

39. The Defendants are each individually a "collector" as defined under MD. Code Comm. Law § 14-201(b).

40. The debt is a "consumer transaction" as defined under MD. Code Comm. Law § 14-201(c).

41. The Defendants repeatedly contacted the Plaintiff with the intent to harass or abuse, in violation of MD. Code Comm. Law § 14-202(6).

42. The Defendants used obscene and grossly abusive language when communicating with the Plaintiff, in violation of MD. Code Comm. Law § 14-202(7).

43. The Plaintiff is entitled to damages proximately caused by the Defendants'

violations.

COUNT III
INVASION OF PRIVACY BY INTRUSION UPON SECLUSION

44. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

45. The *Restatement of Torts, Second*, § 652(b) defines intrusion upon seclusion as, “One who intentionally intrudes...upon the solitude or seclusion of another, or his private affairs or concerns, is subject to liability to the other for invasion of privacy, if the intrusion would be highly offensive to a reasonable person.”

46. Maryland further recognizes the Plaintiff’s right to be free from invasions of privacy, thus Defendants violated Maryland state law.

47. The Defendants intentionally intruded upon Plaintiff’s right to privacy by continually harassing the Plaintiff with repeat phone calls to her home and place of employment, where the Defendants spoke to the Plaintiff in a rude manner, and failing to verify the Debt when requested.

48. The telephone calls made by the Defendants to the Plaintiff were so persistent and repeated with such frequency as to be considered “hounding the plaintiff” and “a substantial burden to her existence,” thus satisfying the *Restatement of Torts, Second*, § 652(b) requirement for an invasion of privacy.

49. The conduct of the Defendants in engaging in the illegal collection activities resulted in multiple invasions of privacy in such a way as would be considered highly offensive to a reasonable person.

50. As a result of the intrusions and invasions, the Plaintiff is entitled to actual damages in an amount to be determined at trial from the Defendants.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against the Defendants:

1. Actual damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1) against the Defendants;
2. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A) against the Defendants;
3. Costs of litigation and reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(3) against the Defendants;
4. Actual damages pursuant to MD. Code Comm. Law § 14-203;
5. Actual damages pursuant to MD. Ann. Code. Bus. Reg. § 7-401(b);
6. Statutory damages pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B) & (C);
7. Actual damages from the Defendants for the all damages suffered as a result of the intentional, reckless, and/or negligent FDCPA violations and intentional, reckless, and/or negligent invasions of privacy in an amount to be determined at trial for the Plaintiff; and
8. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED ON ALL COUNTS

Dated: July 19, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By /s/ Forrest E. Mays

Forrest E. Mays (Bar No. 07510)
2341 N Forrest Drive, Suite 90
Annapolis, MD 21403
Telephone: (410) 267-6297
Facsimile: (410) 267-6234
Email: mayslaw@mac.com

Of Counsel To

LEMBERG & ASSOCIATES L.L.C.
A Connecticut Law Firm
1100 Summer Street, 3rd Floor
Stamford, CT 06905
Telephone: (203) 653-2250
Facsimile: (877) 795-3666
ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF